



MONTANA FISH, WILDLIFE AND PARKS SEEKING QUALIFIED APPLICANTS FOR CASH FARM LEASE

Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks (FWP) is requesting proposals from qualified applicants for an agricultural lease of 622.76 acres at the Great Falls Shooting Complex at T221N; R4E, NW¼ of Section 15 and the NE¼, E½NW¼, N½S½, SW¼SW¼ AND 301.53 acres of Great Falls Shooting Sports Complex Inc at Section 16, T21N, R4E, W½NW¼, S½SE¼, SE¼SW¼ and Section 15, T21N, R4E, NE¼. The lease will be for a three-year period ending October 1, 2021, and may be renewable in three year terms. The lessee will cultivate, plant, and harvest agricultural crops paying each landowner the bid price per acre owned. Required qualifications, including factors to be used to evaluate the respondents and a description of the services to be provided by the selected producer, can be obtained by contacting:

Gary Bertellotti
Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks
4600 Giant Springs Road
Great Falls, MT 59405

(406)454-5840
fwprg42@mt.gov

Package sent to interested respondents

1) Description of services:

Agricultural lease on 622.76 acres of cropland on a portion of the Great Falls Shooting Complex. The agricultural lease will be for a three-year period, beginning December 1, 2018 ending October 1, 2021, and may be renewable in three year terms.

Under this agreement the lessee will cultivate, plant, and harvest agricultural crops and pay each landowner the bid price per acre owned. Lessee will be responsible for weed control within the leased agricultural fields and adjacent property access road. Lessee will maintain regular contact with the designated FWP and Great Falls Shooting Complex representatives to evaluate and coordinate ongoing operations.

Because the property within the leased agricultural fields are adjacent to a shooting range, public access and other non-agricultural uses on the

agricultural fields are not permitted. All expenses incurred in the execution of this lease including, but not limited to, the cost of any fuel, seed, herbicides or other chemicals are incumbent upon the lessee.

Lessee will provide payments and a written report on or before November 1st annually noting any ongoing issues or concern.

Provide a written response to following qualifications or factors that will be used to evaluate lessee candidates:

- Description of experience, including number of years, directly responsible for operating an agricultural operation.
 - Equipment available to successfully cultivate, plant, and harvest agricultural crops.
 - Additional practices related to weed control.
 - Describe what benefits your operation would bring to working on this site by helping to advance soil conservation.
- 2) Applicants will be rated on responses provided in #2. Top candidates meeting qualifications will be offered an on-site (on the WMA) interview to discuss in-person the qualifications, expectations, and the overall lease. The successful candidate will be that applicant best meeting qualifications and showing the ability/desire to complete lease terms.
- 3) The grant of the lease will be contingent upon the approval of the Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks Commission.

Proposals due By Friday, September 21, 2018
Submit Proposals (paper or electronic file) to:
Gary Bertellotti

Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks
4600 Giant Springs Road
Great Falls, MT 59405
fwprg42@mt.gov

**Draft
Environmental Assessment**

**Great Falls Shooting Complex
Agricultural Lease**

August 2018



***Montana Fish,
Wildlife & Parks***

Draft Environmental Assessment

PART I. PROPOSED ACTION DESCRIPTION

1. **Type of proposed state action:** The proposed action calls for the replacing existing agricultural lease for a 3-year period (2019 – 2021) on the Great Falls Shooting Complex (GFSC) near Great Falls, MT.

2. **Agency authority for the proposed action:**

The GFSC is on Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks (MFWP) and the Great Falls Shooting Complex lands. MFWP is authorized to offer utilize the leases payments for the benefit of the GFSC (MCA 87-1-601).

3. **Anticipated Schedule:**

The agricultural lease, if approved by the Montana Fish & Wildlife Commission at its October 2018 meeting, would be valid from December 1, 2018 – October 1, 2021.

4. **Location affected by proposed action (county, range and township – included map):**

The agricultural lease is found on the GFSC which is located just north of Great Falls, MT. The lease is located in T821N R4E Sections 15 and 16.

5. **Project size -- estimate the number of acres that would be directly affected that are currently:**

	<u>Acres</u>		<u>Acres</u>
(a) Developed:		(d) Floodplain	<u>0</u>
Residential	<u>0</u>		
Industrial	<u>0</u>	(e) Productive:	
(existing shop area)		Irrigated cropland	<u>0</u>
(b) Open Space/	<u>0</u>	Dry cropland	<u>622.76</u>
Woodlands/Recreation		Forestry	<u>0</u>
(c) Wetlands/Riparian	<u>0</u>	Rangeland	<u>0</u>
		Other:	<u>0</u>

6. **Permits, Funding & Overlapping Jurisdiction.**

- (a) **Permits:** No permits are needed to implement the proposed action
- (b) **Funding:** The proposed action would not require any additional MFWP funding. Work involved in administering the agricultural leases would be done as part of the regular duties associated with management of the GFSC by MFWP personnel.
- (c) **Other Overlapping or Additional Jurisdictional Responsibilities:**

Agency Name

Type of Responsibility

Great Falls Shooting Sports Complex Inc (GFSSC) – owns 301.53 acres of the Ag land and manages the Shooting Complex portion of the GFSC site on MFWP land.

MFWP – owns 321.23 acres of the Ag land at the GFSC site.

7. Narrative summary of the proposed action:

The proposal is to replace the current agricultural lease on the GFSC with the standard MFWP agricultural lease. This agricultural lease was in place on the GFSC prior to the land acquisition by MFWP (lease acres were farmed prior to the GFSC's creation) and as such the proposed action would retain the long-standing status quo. The agricultural leases provide sustainable agricultural and provides funding for the GFSC.

All of the agricultural leases are farmed for grain crops. The annual lease payment would be based on the number of acres to be farmed for production for the year. MFWP would receive payment and oversee the distribution of funds for the MFWP 321.23 acres, and the GFSSC would receive payment for their 301.53 acres.

Lease rates for the GFSC agricultural leases would be based on the winning bid and the producer who is able to best manage the property.

As mentioned, the agricultural lessees would be responsible for completing specific work (weed control, erosion control, soil conservation agricultural practices) for MFWP as part of the lease arrangement.

If MFWP asks the lessees to do other improvement work on the GFSC during the course of the lease period, the value for that work will be determined on an as needed basis. The cost to the lessee for this additional work would be deducted from either that year's lease payment or the following year's lease payment depending upon the timing.

8. Description and analysis of reasonable alternatives:

Alternative A: No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative the agricultural leases on the GFSC would not be replaced with MFWP's standard agricultural lease agreement. This would likely have negative impacts on MFWP's standing or relationship with the GFSSC, the local agricultural community and the community of Great Falls as a whole.

Alternative B: Proposed Action

MFWP would replace the existing agricultural lease for 3 years (2019 – 2021). Agricultural leases have existed on the GFSC since 2001 and as such the proposed action would retain the long-standing status quo. Managing a portion of the GFSC as agricultural leases provides financial benefits for the GFSC and it also helps improve/maintain MFWP's standing or relationship with the local agricultural community and the local community of Great Falls as a whole.

9. Evaluation and listing of mitigation, stipulation, or other control measures enforceable by the agency or another government agency:

None

PART II. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW CHECKLIST

A. PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

Evaluation of the impacts of the No Action Alternative (Alternative A) including secondary and cumulative impacts on the Physical Environment.

Land Resources: If the current agricultural leases are not replaced, the outdated agricultural lease provided for automatic renewal and both MFWP and GFSSC would need to maintain their property for future agricultural production. No action may impact both MFWP and GFSSC ability to effectively manage the land.

Air: If the No Action alternative were adopted, the current agricultural leases would continue to allow for farming, but would limit both MFWP and GFSSC ability to effectively manage the site.

Water: No change.

Vegetation: If the agricultural lease are not replaced, there may be increased costs to MFWP and GFSSC and an increase in the amount of time spent on noxious weed control reducing the amount of time that could be spent on other work activities.

Fish/Wildlife: No change.

Evaluation of the impacts of the Proposed Action (Alternatives B) including secondary and cumulative impacts on the Physical Environment.

1. <u>LAND RESOURCES</u> Will the proposed action result in:	IMPACT					
	Unknown	None	Minor	Potentially Significant	Can Impact Be Mitigated	Comment Index
a. Soil instability or changes in geologic substructure?		X				
b. Disruption, displacement, erosion, compaction, moisture loss, or over-covering of soil, which would reduce productivity or fertility?			X		X	1b
c. Destruction, covering or modification of any unique geologic or physical features?		X				
d. Changes in siltation, deposition or erosion patterns that may modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed or shore of a lake?		X				

e. Exposure of people or property to earthquakes, landslides, ground failure, or other natural hazard?		X				
--	--	---	--	--	--	--

1b - Given that the leased acres would continue to be dryland farmland, there is the expectation that some level of both wind and water erosion would continue to occur. There would be little to no change from the current status quo in regards to overall erosion levels. The agricultural lease would focus on soil conservation to minimize erosion.

2. <u>AIR</u> Will the proposed action result in:	IMPACT *					
	Unknown	None	Minor	Potentially Significant	Can Impact Be Mitigated	Comment Index
a. Emission of air pollutants or deterioration of ambient air quality? (Also see 13 (c).)			X			2a
b. Creation of objectionable odors?		X				
c. Alteration of air movement, moisture, or temperature patterns or any change in climate, either locally or regionally?		X				
d. Adverse effects on vegetation, including crops, due to increased emissions of pollutants?		X				
e. <u>For P-R/D-J projects</u> , will the project result in any discharge, which will conflict with federal or state air quality regulations? (Also see 2a.)						NA

2a. Minor localized deterioration of ambient air quality would potentially occur when there are farming activities that produce dust or pollution, such as plowing fields, baling hay, and spraying pesticides or herbicides. Those events would be relatively brief in duration and localized to the fields and/or immediate areas around the fields. Cumulative impacts would be minor. All the leases contain the stipulation that lessee use of herbicides or pesticides on the leased lands be in compliance with provisions of Federal and State laws regulating such substances.

NA – Not applicable

3. <u>WATER</u> Will the proposed action result in:	IMPACT					
	Unknown	None	Minor	Potentially Significant	Can Impact Be Mitigated	Comment Index
a. Discharge into surface water or any alteration of surface water quality including but not limited to temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity?		X				
b. Changes in drainage patterns or the rate and amount of surface runoff?		X				
c. Alteration of the course or magnitude of floodwater or other flows?		X				
d. Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body or creation of a new water body?		X				
e. Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding?		X				
f. Changes in the quality of groundwater?		X				
g. Changes in the quantity of groundwater?		X				
h. Increase in risk of contamination of surface or groundwater?		X				
i. Effects on any existing water right or reservation?		X				
j. Effects on other water users as a result of any alteration in surface or groundwater quality?		X				
k. Effects on other users as a result of any alteration in surface or groundwater quantity?		X				
l. <u>For P-R/D-J</u> , will the project affect a designated floodplain? (Also see 3c.)						NA
m. <u>For P-R/D-J</u> , will the project result in any discharge that will affect federal or state water quality regulations? (Also see 3a.)						NA

All – There would be no change from the status quo in regards to the potential impacts on water resources as the leases are currently being farmed and have been for decades. There could be potential for continued impacts of agricultural practices, such as the application of fertilizer and herbicides, on water resources. All the leases contain the stipulation that lessee use of herbicides or pesticides on the leased lands be in compliance with provisions of Federal and State laws regulating such substances.

NA – Not applicable

4. <u>VEGETATION</u> Will the proposed action result in?	IMPACT					
	Unknown	None	Minor	Potentially Significant	Can Impact Be Mitigated	Comment Index
a. Changes in the diversity, productivity or abundance of plant species (including trees, shrubs, grass, crops, and aquatic plants)?		X				
b. Alteration of a plant community?		X				
c. Adverse effects on any unique, rare, threatened, or endangered species?		X				
d. Reduction in acreage or productivity of any agricultural land?		X				
e. Establishment or spread of noxious weeds?		X				
f. <u>For P-R/D-J</u> , will the project affect wetlands, or prime and unique farmland?						NA
g. Other:						

All – There would be no change from the status quo in regards to the potential impacts (including secondary and cumulative) on the vegetation resources as the leases are currently being farmed and have been for decades. The agricultural lands that are under lease on the GFSC pre-date the existence of the GFSC, so the plant communities in those fields were long ago altered from the original plant community. Lessees are required to control the growth and spread of noxious weeds as a requirement of their lease.

NA – Not applicable

5. <u>FISH/WILDLIFE</u> Will the proposed action result in:	IMPACT					
	Unknown	None	Minor	Potentially Significant	Can Impact Be Mitigated	Comment Index
a. Deterioration of critical fish or wildlife habitat?		X				
b. Changes in the diversity or abundance of game animals or bird species?		X				
c. Changes in the diversity or abundance of nongame species?		X				
d. Introduction of new species into an area?		X				
e. Creation of a barrier to the migration or movement of animals?		X				
f. Adverse effects on any unique, rare, threatened, or endangered species?		X				
g. Increase in conditions that stress wildlife populations or limit abundance (including harassment, legal or illegal harvest or other human activity)?		X				
h. <u>For P-R/D-J</u> , will the project be performed in any area in which T&E species are present, and will the project affect any T&E species or their habitat? (Also see 5f.)						NA

i. <u>For P-R/D-J</u> , will the project introduce or export any species not presently or historically occurring in the receiving location? (Also see 5d.)						NA
--	--	--	--	--	--	----

All – There would be no change from the status quo in regards to the potential impacts on fish/wildlife resources as the leases are currently being farmed and have been farmed for decades.

NA – Not applicable

B. HUMAN ENVIRONMENT

Evaluation of the impacts of the No Action Alternative (Alternative A) including secondary and cumulative impacts on the Human Environment.

Noise/Electrical Effects: If the No Action alternative is selected, the existing agricultural lease provides for automatic renewal.

Land Use: The No Action alternative would result in no change to the existing land use, but would severely impact MFWP and GFSSC ability to manage the land.

Risk/Health Hazards: If the No Action alternative is selected, the potential for agricultural-related risks or health hazards, including pollution from pesticides, would be remain the same.

Community Impact: If the No Action alternative is selected, MFWP's ability to proactively manage the site will be reduced which may cause additional conflicts between the various parties using the GFSC site.

Public Services/Taxes/Utilities: There would be no expected impacts related to public services/taxes/utilities if the No Action alternative is adopted.

Aesthetics/Recreation: If the No Action alternative is selected, the land could become weed patches that some members of the public might find aesthetically offensive.

Cultural/Historic Resources: There would be no expected impacts related to cultural/historic resources if the No Action alternative is adopted.

Summary Evaluation of Significance for the No Action Alternative: If the No Action alternative is selected, there would be negative impacts on both the physical and human environment.

Evaluation of the impacts of the Preferred Alternative (Alternatives B) including secondary and cumulative impacts on the Human Environment.

6. <u>NOISE/ELECTRICAL EFFECTS</u> Will the proposed action result in:	IMPACT					
	Unknown	None	Minor	Potentially Significant	Can Impact Be Mitigated	Comment Index
a. Increases in existing noise levels?		X				
b. Exposure of people to severe or nuisance noise levels?		X				
c. Creation of electrostatic or electromagnetic effects that could be detrimental to human health or property?		X				
d. Interference with radio or television reception and operation?		X				

The status quo would be maintained in that the existing agricultural operations would continue to create noise during certain times of the year. No cumulative effects would be expected.

7. <u>LAND USE</u> Will the proposed action result in:	IMPACT					
	Unknown	None	Minor	Potentially Significant	Can Impact Be Mitigated	Comment Index
a. Alteration of or interference with the productivity or profitability of the existing land use of an area?		X				7a
b. Conflict with a designated natural area or area of unusual scientific or educational importance?		X				
c. Conflict with any existing land use whose presence would constrain or potentially prohibit the proposed action?		X				
d. Adverse effects on or relocation of residences?		X				

7a – Replacing the GFSC agricultural leases would maintain the productivity and profitability of the existing land use. No cumulative impacts on land use would be expected if the leases were replaced.

8. <u>RISK/HEALTH HAZARDS</u> Will the proposed action result in:	IMPACT					
	Unknown	None	Minor	Potentially Significant	Can Impact Be Mitigated	Comment Index
a. Risk of an explosion or release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to oil, pesticides, chemicals, or radiation) in the event of an accident or other forms of disruption?			X		X	8a
b. Affect an existing emergency response or emergency evacuation plan, or create a need for a new plan?		X				
c. Creation of any human health hazard or potential hazard?			X		X	8c
d. For P-R/D-J , will any chemical toxicants be used? (Also see 8a)						NA

8a – While there is always the risk of a pesticide or other farm chemical spill, the amount being used or present on site at any given time is relatively small and would likely not have much of an impact on the environment. In addition, all the leases contain the stipulation that lessee use of herbicides or pesticides on the leased lands be in compliance with all provisions of Federal and State laws regulating such substances.

8c – For the lessees, working around and with agricultural machinery can be dangerous. Dust produced from farming activities such as plowing, baling hay, combining grain crops could impact individuals with breathing issues. However, those events would be relatively brief in duration and localized to the fields and/or immediate areas around the fields.

Cumulative impacts associated with risk/health hazards would be expected to be very minor, if the agricultural leases are replaced.

9. <u>COMMUNITY IMPACT</u> Will the proposed action result in:	IMPACT					
	Unknown	None	Minor	Potentially Significant	Can Impact Be Mitigated	Comment Index
a. Alteration of the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of the human population of an area?		X				
b. Alteration of the social structure of a community?		X				
c. Alteration of the level or distribution of employment or community or personal income?		X				9c
d. Changes in industrial or commercial activity?		X				
e. Increased traffic hazards or effects on existing transportation facilities or patterns of movement of people and goods?		X				
10. <u>PUBLIC SERVICES/TAXES/UTILITIES</u> Will the proposed action result in:	IMPACT					
	Unknown	None	Minor	Potentially Significant	Can Impact Be Mitigated	Comment Index
		X				

a. Will the proposed action have an effect upon or result in a need for new or altered governmental services in any of the following areas: fire or police protection, schools, parks/recreational facilities, roads or other public maintenance, water supply, sewer or septic systems, solid waste disposal, health, or other governmental services? If any, specify:						
b. Will the proposed action have an effect upon the local or state tax base and revenues?			X			10b
c. Will the proposed action result in a need for new facilities or substantial alterations of any of the following utilities: electric power, natural gas, other fuel supply or distribution systems, or communications?		X				
d. Will the proposed action result in increased use of any energy source?		X				
e. Define projected revenue sources						10e
f. Define projected maintenance costs.						10f

9c/10b – Replacing the existing agricultural lease would maintain the status quo in regards to the lessees earning taxable income.

10e – Lease rates for the GFSC agricultural leases would be based on the winning bid. This revenue is used for the benefit of the GFSC.

10f - The proposed action would not require any additional MFWP funding. Work involved in administering the agricultural leases would be done as part of the regular duties associated with management of the GFSC by MFWP personnel.

No cumulative impacts to the community or public services/taxes/utilities would be expected if the agricultural leases were replaced.

11. <u>AESTHETICS/RECREATION</u> Will the proposed action result in:	IMPACT					
	Unknown	None	Minor	Potentially Significant	Can Impact Be Mitigated	Comment Index
a. Alteration of any scenic vista or creation of an aesthetically offensive site or effect that is open to public view?		X				
b. Alteration of the aesthetic character of a community or neighborhood?		X				
c. Alteration of the quality or quantity of recreational/tourism opportunities and settings?		X				11c
d. For P-R/D-J , will any designated or proposed wild or scenic rivers, trails or wilderness areas be impacted? (Also see 11a, 11c.)						NA

All – Replacing the agricultural leases would maintain the existing status quo.

11c - The GFSC is utilized by the public for other recreational purposes.

No cumulative impacts to aesthetics/recreation would be expected if the agricultural leases were replaced.

12. <u>CULTURAL/HISTORICAL RESOURCES</u> Will the proposed action result in:	IMPACT					
	Unknown	None	Minor	Potentially Significant	Can Impact Be Mitigated	Comment Index
a. Destruction or alteration of any site, structure or object of prehistoric, historic, or paleontological importance?		X				
b. Physical change that would affect unique cultural values?		X				
c. Effects on existing religious or sacred uses of a site or area?		X				
d. <u>For P-R/D-J</u> , will the project affect historic or cultural resources? Attach SHPO letter of clearance. (Also see 12.a.)						NA

NA – Not applicable

The status quo would be maintained if the existing leases are replaced. No cumulative impacts to cultural/historic resources would be expected if the agricultural leases were replaced.

SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA

13. <u>SUMMARY EVALUATION OF SIGNIFICANCE</u> Will the proposed action, considered as a whole:	IMPACT					
	Unknown	None	Minor	Potentially Significant	Can Impact Be Mitigated	Comment Index
a. Have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (A project or program may result in impacts on two or more separate resources that create a significant effect when considered together or in total.)		X				
b. Involve potential risks or adverse effects, which are uncertain but extremely hazardous if they were to occur?			X		X	13b.
c. Potentially conflict with the substantive requirements of any local, state, or federal law, regulation, standard or formal plan?		X				
d. Establish a precedent or likelihood that future actions with significant environmental impacts will be proposed?		X				
e. Generate substantial debate or controversy about the nature of the impacts that would be created?		X				
f. <u>For P-R/D-J</u> , is the project expected to have organized opposition or generate substantial public controversy? (Also see 13e.)						NA

g. For P-R/D-J, list any federal or state permits required.						NA
---	--	--	--	--	--	----

13b. – There are inherent potential risks and health hazards associated with farming, mostly to the individuals doing the farming. However, farming activities associated with the GFSC agricultural lease are limited in time and space. In addition, while there is always the risk of a pesticide or other farm chemical spill involved in farming, the amount being used or present on site at any given time is relatively small and thus impacts on the environment would be extremely limited. All the leases contain the stipulation that lessee use of herbicides or pesticides on the leased lands be in compliance with all provisions of Federal and State laws regulating such substances.

NA – Not applicable

There are no expected cumulative impacts on any resources from the proposed project. Replacing the existing agricultural lease would maintain the long-standing status quo, as the GFSC has had an agricultural lease since its inception.

PART III. NARRATIVE EVALUATION AND COMMENT

This analysis did not reveal any significant impacts to the human or physical environment from the Proposed Action. Replacing the existing agricultural lease on the GFSC will provide many positive benefits to the community. This agricultural lease has existed on the GFSC since 2001 and as such the proposed action would retain the long-standing status quo. Managing a portion of the GFSC as an agricultural lease provides positive benefits (weed control, erosion control, soil conservation agricultural practices) and it also helps improve and/or maintain MFWP's relationship with the local agricultural community, the GFSC and the local community of Great Falls as a whole.

PART IV. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

1. Public involvement:

The public will be notified in the following manners to comment on this current EA, the proposed action and alternatives:

- Public notices in the Great Falls Tribune
- News release sent by FWP Region 4
- Public notice on the Fish, Wildlife & Parks web page: <http://fwp.mt.gov>.

Copies of this environmental assessment will be distributed to interested parties to ensure their knowledge of the proposed project. This level of public notice and participation is appropriate for a project of this scope having limited impacts.

2. Duration of comment period:

The public comment period will extend for (30) thirty days following the publication of the second legal notice in area newspapers. Written or email comments will be accepted until 5:00 p.m., September 10, 2018 and can be mailed or emailed to the addresses below:

Attention: Gary Bertellotti
Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks

4600 Giant Springs Road
Great Falls, MT 59405
(406)454-5840
Fwp42@mt.gov

PART V. EA PREPARATION

1. **Based on the significance criteria evaluated in this EA, is an EIS required? (YES/NO)?
If an EIS is not required, explain why the EA is the appropriate level of analysis for
this proposed action.**

No, an EIS is not required. Based on an evaluation of impacts to the physical and human environment under MEPA, this environmental review revealed no significant impacts from the proposed action; therefore, an environmental assessment is deemed to be the appropriate level of analysis.

2. **Person(s) responsible for preparing the EA:**

Nate Mildren, MFWP Land Agent – Helena
Gary Bertellotti, Regional Supervisor – Great Falls

3. **List of agencies or offices consulted during preparation of the EA:**

Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks
Wildlife Division

Figure 1. ADD MAPS



United States
Department of
Agriculture

Cascade County, Montana



Common Land Unit

- Cropland
- Rangeland
- Other Use
- Tract Boundary

Wetland Determination Identifiers

- Restricted Use
- Limited Restrictions
- Exempt from Conservation Compliance Provisions

Tract Cropland Total: 215.23 acres

2018 Program Year

Map Created March 10, 2017

Farm **6115**

Tract **10899**


16-21N-4E

United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Farm Service Agency (FSA) maps are for FSA Program administration only. This map does not represent a legal survey or reflect actual ownership; rather it depicts the information provided directly from the producer and/or National Agricultural Imagery Program (NAIP) imagery. The producer accepts the data 'as is' and assumes all risks associated with its use. USDA-FSA assumes no responsibility for actual or consequential damage incurred as a result of any user's reliance on this data outside FSA Programs. Wetland identifiers do not represent the size, shape, or specific determination of the area. Refer to your original determination (CPA-026 and attached maps) for exact boundaries and determinations or contact USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS).



United States
Department of
Agriculture

Cascade County, Montana



Common Land Unit

- Cropland
- Rangeland

- Other Use
- Tract Boundary

Wetland Determination Identifiers

- Restricted Use
- Limited Restrictions
- Exempt from Conservation Compliance Provisions

Tract Cropland Total: 111.00 acres

2018 Program Year

Map Created March 10, 2017

Farm **6115**

Tract **10896**

15-21N-4E

United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Farm Service Agency (FSA) maps are for FSA Program administration only. This map does not **represent** a legal survey or reflect actual ownership; rather it depicts the information provided directly from the producer and/or National Agricultural Imagery Program (NAIP) imagery. The **producer** accepts the data 'as is' and assumes all risks associated with its use. USDA-FSA assumes no responsibility for actual or consequential damage incurred as a result of any user's reliance on this data outside FSA Programs. Wetland identifiers do not represent the size, shape, or specific determination of the area. Refer to your original determination (CPA-026 and attached maps) for exact boundaries and determinations or contact USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS).



United States
Department of
Agriculture

Cascade County, Montana



Common Land Unit Tract Boundary

- Cropland
- Other Use

Wetland Determination Identifiers

- Restricted Use
- Limited Restrictions
- Exempt from Conservation Compliance Provisions

Tract Cropland Total: 117.69 acres

2018 Program Year

Map Created March 10, 2017

Farm **6116**

Tract **10900**

16-21N-4E

United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Farm Service Agency (FSA) maps are for FSA Program administration only. This map does not represent a legal survey or reflect actual ownership; rather it depicts the information provided directly from the producer and/or National Agricultural Imagery Program (NAIP) imagery. The producer accepts the data 'as is' and assumes all risks associated with its use. USDA-FSA assumes no responsibility for actual or consequential damage incurred as a result of any user's reliance on this data outside FSA Programs. Wetland identifiers do not represent the size, shape, or specific determination of the area. Refer to your original determination (CPA-026 and attached maps) for exact boundaries and determinations or contact USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS).



United States
Department of
Agriculture

Cascade County, Montana



Common Land Unit Tract Boundary

- Cropland
- Rangeland

Wetland Determination Identifiers

- Restricted Use
- ▼ Limited Restrictions
- Exempt from Conservation Compliance Provisions

Tract Cropland Total: 55.81 acres

2018 Program Year

Map Created March 10, 2017

Farm **6116**

Tract **10898**

16-21N-4E

United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Farm Service Agency (FSA) maps are for FSA Program administration only. This map does not represent a legal survey or reflect actual ownership; rather it depicts the information provided directly from the producer and/or National Agricultural Imagery Program (NAIP) imagery. The producer accepts the data 'as is' and assumes all risks associated with its use. USDA-FSA assumes no responsibility for actual or consequential damage incurred as a result of any user's reliance on this data outside FSA Programs. Wetland identifiers do not represent the size, shape, or specific determination of the area. Refer to your original determination (CPA-026 and attached maps) for exact boundaries and determinations or contact USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS).



United States
Department of
Agriculture

Cascade County, Montana



Common Land Unit

- Cropland
- Rangeland
- Other Use
- Tract Boundary

Wetland Determination Identifiers

- Restricted Use
- Limited Restrictions
- Exempt from Conservation Compliance Provisions

Tract Cropland Total: 128.03 acres

2018 Program Year

Map Created March 10, 2017

Farm **6116**

Tract **10897**

15-21N-4E

United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Farm Service Agency (FSA) maps are for FSA Program administration only. This map does not represent a legal survey or reflect actual ownership; rather it depicts the information provided directly from the producer and/or National Agricultural Imagery Program (NAIP) imagery. The producer accepts the data 'as is' and assumes all risks associated with its use. USDA-FSA assumes no responsibility for actual or consequential damage incurred as a result of any user's reliance on this data outside FSA Programs. Wetland identifiers do not represent the size, shape, or specific determination of the area. Refer to your original determination (CPA-026 and attached maps) for exact boundaries and determinations or contact USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS).